REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 and 9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the title is amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 1, objects to the title as allegedly being non-descriptive. The title is amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 3, rejects claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2,325,329 to Ahan in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0067434 to Haga et al. (hereinafter "Haga") and U.S. Patent No. 5,534,809 to Watanabe et al. (hereinafter "Watanabe"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, a plurality of the signal-supplying lines comprising wiring lines from the input terminals to the control input terminals and further recites the wiring lines having the same width and length. The Office Action concedes that Ahan and Watanabe, even in combination, fail to teach at least this feature of claim 1. The Office Action relies on Haga for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Ahan and Watanabe. The analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reasons.

Haga, in paragraph [0117], teaches that disposing a level shifter-timing buffer on both sides of the display area eliminates decline in the driving capability of the gate drivers of the scanning circuit as well as the delay between both ends of the gate lines. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to make these lines the same widths and lengths so as to be almost equal in load capacitance to each other, as allegedly taught in Watanabe, because Haga already teaches that the decline in driving capability and delay

between different gate lines is eliminated. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not additionally make the signal lines the same width and length.

The Office Action, in paragraph 4, rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,057,589 to Shin et al. (hereinafter "Shin") in view of Watanabe. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 recites, among other features, signal-supplying lines having first ends that are arranged close together and second ends that are arranged close together, all of signal-supplying lines having the same width. Claim 9 further recites a length being the same for each signal-supplying line from the first end thereof, through a portion of the first wiring and through the second wiring line, to the control input terminal of the corresponding switching element. The Office Action, on page 6, concedes that Shin cannot reasonably be considered to teach the above-quoted features of claim 9. The Office Action relies on Watanabe for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Shin. This analysis of the Office Action also fails for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action, on page 6, asserts that it would have been obvious to combine Shin and Watanabe so that each signal-supplying line, from the first terminal to the control input terminal, may be equal in load capacitance. However, Shin teaches at col. 10, lines 28-44, that switching elements for recharging are used to solve the problem of resistances of signal lines and gate capacitors causing poor images. Specifically, Shin teaches that the differences in rising time and falling time between switching signals H_1 to H_N are eliminated by generating precharge control signals. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Watanabe with Shin because Shin already provides a solution for the problem the Office Action asserts as providing motivation to combine those references.

Further, even if a skilled artisan could interpret random limitedly related teachings of the applied references to have suggested all of the features of claims 1 and 9, such a conclusion would not have been obvious and can only reasonably be arrived at through the impermissible application of hindsight reasoning based on the roadmap provided by Applicants' disclosure in attempting to render obvious the subject matter of the pending claims.

Focusing on the obviousness of substitutions or differences is improper; rather, the claimed invention must be considered as a whole. *Gillette Co. v. S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.*, 919 F.2d 720, 724 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Precedent teaches that it is impermissible simply to engage in a hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention, using the patent as a template and selecting elements from references to fill the gaps. See, e.g., *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 1998), citing *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 986 (Fed. Cir. 1991), citing in turn *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Rather, there must be "something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination." See, e.g., *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d at 1356, and the cases cited therein. See also *In re Fulton*, 391 F.3d 1195, 1200 (Fed. Cir. 2004), citing *Rouffet*; *Sibia Neurosciences*, 225 F.3d at 1356; and *ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.*, 159 F.3d 534, 546 (Fed. Cir. 1998). As variously stated by the Federal Circuit, there must be some reason, teaching, suggestion, inference, motivation, or incentive in the prior art to make the selections made by the inventor and combine the prior art to produce the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Rouffet*, 149 F.3d at 1355; *Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568, 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *Gorman*, 933 F.2d at 986-987; and *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 281, 297 n.24 (Fed. Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 475 U.S. 1017 (1986). Furthermore, a motivation to combine only flows from a combination that is, on balance, desirable, not merely feasible. See *In re Fulton*, 391 F.3d at 1200, citing *Winner Int'l*

Royalty Corp. v. Wang, 202 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2000). As explained by the *Winner Int'l Royalty Corp.* court, "[t]rade-offs often concern what is feasible, not what is, on balance, desirable. Motivation to combine requires the latter." This standard is not met here.

Accordingly, even if the references could somehow be interpreted to together teach all of the features of claims 1 and 9, the Office Action fails to provide proper motivation as to why a skilled artisan would have combined Ahan, Haga and Watanabe or Shin and Watanabe to achieve the above-quoted features of claims 1 and 9, respectively.

For at least the above reasons, the applied references are not combinable in the manner suggested and cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features positively recited in at least independent claims 1 and 9. Further, claim 6 would also not have been suggested by the applied references for at least the respective dependence of this claim on an allowable claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that claim 6 recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied references are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 6 and 9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:GMH/mef

Date: August 1, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461